

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C §112 Objections

Claims 9, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, claims 9, 17, and 26 were originally rejected in the Office Action dated 3/24/04 for including language allegedly not supported in the "specification". In response to the rejections to claims 9, 17, and 26 in the Office Action of 3/24/04, Applicant amended claims 9, 17, and 26 to recite a limitation that more closely reflected specific language found on page 7 of Applicant's description.

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's amendment of claims 9, 17, and 26 in response to the Office Action mailed on 3/24/04 was in error and unnecessary under §608.01(I) and §608.04 of the MPEP. Specifically, §608.01(I) states, in relevant part, that:

"In establishing a disclosure, applicant may rely not only on the description and drawing as filed but also on the original claims if their content justifies it. Where subject matter not shown in the drawing or described in the description is claimed in the application as filed, and such original claim itself constitutes a clear disclosure of this subject matter, then the claim should be treated on its merits, and requirement made to amend the drawing and description to show this subject matter. The claim should not be attacked by objection or rejection because this subject matter is lacking in the drawing and description. It is the drawing and description that are defective, not the claim." (MPEP, §608.01(I), para. 1 and 2)

In light of the above excerpt from the MPEP, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action of 3/24/04 was in error in rejecting claims 9, 17, and 26 under §112, para. 1., and that the appropriate action by the Examiner should have been to object to the disclosure and not the claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 9, 17, and 26 have been amended to their originally-filed form while Applicant's disclosure has been amended on Page 7 to include similar language.

By amending the disclosure Applicant has not added new matter, as the matter was originally disclosed in claims 9, 17, and 26 as filed. Accordingly, Applicant submits the application is condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,892,962 (hereinafter "Cloutier") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,603,043 (hereinafter "Taylor") and U.S. Patent 5,682,491 (hereinafter "Pechanek"). Particularly, the Office Action asserts that all limitations of claims 1, 10, and 18 are taught by Cloutier, except for limitations in these claims relating to a plurality of removable complex arithmetic elements (CAEs), which is allegedly taught by Taylor, and except for limitations relating to the plurality of CAEs including a sequencer and an arithmetic unit, which is allegedly taught by Pechanek. Therefore, the Office Action concludes, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cloutier, Taylor, and Pechanek to arrive at what is claimed in claims 1, 10, and 18.

Claims 1, 10, and 18 have been amended to state that each of the plurality of sequencers are to sequence data to only the arithmetic unit to which the sequencer corresponds. Pechanek, on the other hand, not only fails to teach a CAE comprising

a sequencer (see Figure 5b-9, for example, which depict a plurality of processing elements and one or more sequencers shared by a plurality of processing elements and not included within any particular processing element), but fails to teach a plurality of CAEs, each including a sequencer to sequence data to only the arithmetic unit within the CAE in which the sequencer is included, as in presently amended claims 1, 10, and 18.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither claims 1, 10, 18 as presently amended, nor any claim that depends from them, can be said to be obvious under Cloutier in view of Taylor and Pechanek. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Erik Metzger at (512) 732-3922.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 8, 2005



Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300